

Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/710,253	HOHMANN ET AL.
	Examiner Katherine W. Mitchell	Art Unit 3677

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Katherine W. Mitchell.

(3) _____.

(2) David Grover.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 17 April 2007.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 12,13,18,24,26,30 and 31.

Identification of prior art discussed: 370028.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: applicant called to get clarification on allowability of claims 30 and 31. Examiner reviewed and agreed that the rejection over CCollister was withdrawn, and thus the claims allowed on the advisory action cover sheet should have stated that claims 30,31 were allowed.

Examiner noted to applicant that another reference has been found, US 370,028 to VOTAW, and that all claims will be reviewed in view of that patent prior to allowance. However, if any claims were determined to be rejectable over/in view of Votaw, any action would result in the previous final action having the finality withdrawn, and a new action using Votaw would be provided without needing an RCE. .